



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/037,563

12/21/2001

Ronald Earl Pruitt

PLC-001

7111

51414 7590 09/08/2008

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
EXCHANGE PLACE  
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881

EXAMINER

MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3692

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/08/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PatentBos@goodwinprocter.com  
hmcpeake@goodwinprocter.com  
glenn.williams@goodwinprocter.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/037,563	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PRUITT, RONALD EARL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Susanna M. Diaz	<b>Art Unit</b> 3692	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Susanna M. Diaz (Primary Examiner). (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Joel Lehrer (Applicant's representative). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 25 August 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
           c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
     If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schulz, Peterson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative explained the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. Applicant's representative subsequently presented the Examiner with a proposed claim amendment to claim 1, which Examiner agreed would overcome the current rejection of claim 1; however, the Examiner will have to perform an updated search upon formal submission of the proposed amendment before a decision can be made regarding allowability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Susanna M. Diaz/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3692	
--	--